

In the Specification:

↙
Page 6, line 20, please delete "preparation" and insert -- prevention --.

REMARKS

The Examiner states that claims 1-11 are pending in the application. However, Applicants filed 16 claims. Clarification is requested.

Support for amendment to claim 1 for the term "synthetic" may be found in the specification on page 3, lines 6-10. Support for amendments to claims 14-16 may be found for example on page 2, lines 7-12, and page 6, lines 10-23.

Amendment to the specification (page 6, line 20) was to correct a typographical error.

35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite for "merely reciting a use without any active, positive steps delimitating how this use is actually practiced". However, claims 1-11 are directed to compositions. Clarification or withdrawal of this rejection in view of claims 1-11 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because "the claimed recitation of use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of process....". However, as noted above, claims 1-11 are directed to compositions. Clarification or withdrawal of this rejection in view of claims 1-11 is respectfully requested.

Improper Multiple Dependent Claims

Claims 8-12 were objected as being in improper form, "because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only and cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim".

Applicants believe this rejection has been overcome by the foregoing amendments.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as anticipated in view of EP 140 596 (Easton). This rejection is respectfully traversed.


It is well settled that proper application of a §102 rejection requires that a single prior art reference identically disclose the claimed invention. Easton contains no disclosure of synthetic sulfated polysaccharides selected from the group consisting of sulfated cellulose derivatives and sulfated polyanionic polysaccharides. Please note that Applicants invention relates only to synthetic

Docket No: JJM-399
Serial No: 09/254,407

(i.e., chemically sulfated) polysaccharides and not "(n)aturally occurring sulfated polyanionic polysaccharides such as chondroitin sulfate" which have been specifically excluded from the scope of the present invention (see, specification, page 3, lines 6-10). Since Easton does not identically disclose the invention as claimed by Applicants, this rejection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant believes the application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and early notice of allowance are earnestly solicited. The Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 10-0750/JJM-399/TJS any additional fees which may be required. If any questions arise which can be disposed through interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Theodore J. Shatynski
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,676

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-2498
DATED: December 6, 2000